

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19-22, 24-27 and 29-33 were pending and presented for reconsideration. In an Office Action dated April 2, 2009 claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19-22, 24-27 and 29-33 were rejected. Claims 1, 19, 24, and 30 are amended.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them. The Applicants incorporate by reference the arguments made in the Amendments and Responses filed previously in addition to the arguments presented herein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-9, 11-12, and 17-30 are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2007/0016909 (“Gautier”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A computer implemented method for dynamically rendering data in a markup language, the method comprising:

- identifying a symbol in the data in the markup language, the symbol indicating a query of a data set, the query containing one or more variables, each variable of one of a plurality of data types, wherein the markup language is augmented with a variable resolution functionality to support the variables, each variable resolving to two or more variable values;
- accessing the data set in order to generate a resolution to the query, wherein the one or more variables contained in the query are resolved as part of the generation of the resolution to the query, the query associated with a tag in the markup language;
- substituting the two or more variable values for each variable into the query to generate two or more completed queries; and
- dynamically rendering the resolution to the two or more completed queries together as a part of the markup language**, according to at least one rule associated with the markup language wherein said symbol can be used to dynamically render multiple data sets.

Hence, claim 1 recites a method for dynamically rendering data in a markup language comprising, identifying a symbol representing a query containing one or more variables. The markup language is augmented with variable resolution functionality and resolves each variable to two or more values. A data set is accessed to generate resolution to the query and the two or more variable values are substituted for each variable to generate two or more completed queries. The completed queries are rendered together as part of the markup language. Gautier does not disclose several limitations of claim 1.

In particular, the limitation “dynamically rendering the resolution to the two or more completed queries **together** as a part of the markup language” recites that the two or more completed queries are rendered **together** as part of the markup language. The two or more completed queries are generated by substituting the two or more variable values for each variable into the query.

The office action mentions (on page 11 of Final Office Action) that “the distance information variable of Gautier resolves to two or more variables, either .2 miles or 0.2m.” As shown in Gautier, the document of Fig. 3a is compiled into **either** the document shown in Fig. 3b **or** the document shown in Fig. 3c (but not both). FIG. 3b is the output for “High Performance Device” and FIG. 3c is the output for “Low Performance Device.” The document of Fig. 3b uses the value “0.2 miles” and the document of FIG. 3c uses “0.2 m,” but there is no compiled document that uses **both** the values “0.2 miles” and “0.2 m.” Paragraph 0032 describes the step 204 of FIG. 2 as “The server 102 compiles at 204 ... by selecting **one of the alternate items** of content, based on the optimization constraint.” Hence Gautier does not disclose the limitation “dynamically rendering the resolution to the two or more completed queries **together** as a part of the markup language.”

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gautier and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0198874 ("Nasr"). Nasr discloses retrieving information in a markup language through a query engine and presenting the information in another markup language. However, Nasr does not remedy the above deficiencies of Gautier.

Therefore the references in isolation or in combination do not disclose the limitations of claim 1. Independent claims 19 and 24 are amended to incorporate limitations similar to claim 1. The dependent claims incorporate the limitations of the independent claims. Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons described above in addition to the further patentable features recited therein.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that all of the stated grounds of objection and rejection set forth in the Office Action have been properly accommodated or addressed. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and withdraw them. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if it is felt that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted.

Date: February 19, 2010

By: / Rajendra B. Panwar /

Rajendra B. Panwar, Reg. No. 63,165
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7107
Fax: (650) 938-5200